



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/084,723	02/25/2002	Nigel D. Young	GB010051	8250

24737 7590 09/30/2003

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS  
P.O. BOX 3001  
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

MANDALA, VICTOR A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2826

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

10/084,723

Applicant(s)

YOUNG, NIGEL D.

Examiner

Victor A. Mandala Jr.

Art Unit

2826

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 11 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

NATHAN J. FLYNN  
SUPERVISOR, PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant argues that U.S. Patent No. 6,323,832 Nishigawa does not teach flexing to occur at the pixel elements, but between the pixel elements. The examiner has considered the applicant's arguments but finds them to be nonpersuasive. The afterfinal request for reconsideration filed 8/11/03, the Applicant argues about the flexing occurring between the pixel elements in Nishigawa, but the examiner finds the term "pixel element" nowhere in the claims, but the Applicant directs the term pixel elements to mean the semiconductor devices, (Figure 3b #1a, 2a, & 3a), on page two line 4 of the afterfinal, so the examiner will assume the Applicant is referring to the semiconductor devices as claimed. The Applicant also refers to the pixel elements to be the claimed pixel electrodes as stated in the afterfinal on page 2 lines 7-8. The Applicant is arguing the flexing occurs at the pixel elements, which by the Applicant's disclosure would mean that the Applicant is referring to the pixel elements to be the pixel electrodes. The afterfinal is found by the examiner to be unclear as to what the newly introduced term pixel elements is meant by, but the further arguments will use the pixel elements as the semiconductor devices since the Applicant refers them to Figure 3b #1a, 2a, & 3a, which coincides with the final rejection filed on 6/02/03. The examiner finds Nishigawa to teach all of the claimed elements. The Applicant states in the afterfinal request for reconsideration filed 8/11/03 on page 2 lines 5-6 that Nishigawa teaches the flexing to occur in the area between the semiconductor devices, (pixel elements), which the Applicant's claims teach. The claim states semiconductor devices, (pixel elements), arranged in a regular array and occupying respective first areas of the substrate and pixel electrodes correspondingly coupled to each of the semiconductor devices, (pixel elements), and occupying respective second areas of the substrate; wherein the substrate is configured such that the flexing occurs more readily at the second areas than at the first areas. The claim teaches the flexing to occur in a second area which the pixel electrodes are and not in the first area where the semiconductor devices are. The claim also teaches that the pixel electrodes are between the semiconductor devices and couple the semiconductor devices correspondingly together. As stated by the Applicant in the afterfinal request for reconsideration filed 8/11/03 that Nishigawa does teach the flexing to occur between the semiconductor devices, (pixel elements) and as stated in the final rejection all the claimed elements are taught by Nishigawa, thus the rejections stand as is.